Organizational Management Sub-Committee Focus Survey
A Brief Summary of Results

Submitted by the CPBM's Organizational Management's Sub-Committee, Gary Vansuch - Chair

INTRODUCTION

The Organizational Management sub-committee (OM) of AASHTO's Committee on Performance Based Management (CPBM) conducted a brief survey during the summer of 2023. The purpose of the survey was to ask members of CPBM and its associated sub-committees a series of questions to provide information to the OM on areas of interest and/or need on which the sub-committee could focus.

Distributed via email by AASHTO staff, the survey collected 15 responses. Associations of the respondents are given in *Appendix 1 – Respondents*. Given the small number of responses, the actual responses are provided in *Appendix 2 – Survey Comments*. Comments are presented with minimal editing and a tracking number which allows for following comments by respondent across the survey.

The survey was based on the OM's current goals. In each goal area, respondents were asked to share:

- What issues were impacting agencies' ability to be successful
- What topics/areas should be explored and shared to help agencies with those issues
- What good examples from the respondent's state might be shared
- What good examples the respondent might be aware of from other states.

Respondents were also asked to share their thoughts on the most pressing issues organizations were facing as they worked to improve.

By goal, followed by "most pressing" issues, are summaries of topics/themes within responses shared. These are presented to support conversation, not as a definitive set of topics.

GOAL 1 - Assist agencies to achieve strategic goal and improve performance in the most effective and efficient way.

Issues shared included:

- Work Force – Staff turnover, replacement efforts, and retention issues are impacting successful delivery of work, process/work knowledge, and ability to adapt.
- Politics – The often abrupt nature of political change is negatively impacting both the ability to meet strategic goals and the willingness of leadership to invest the effort necessary set direction, focus, and governance practices.
- Resources – Resources are often too thin to cover identified needs and priorities. Ironically, an the assumed availability of resources and influence on transportation systems, agencies can find themselves pulled into tangential areas/efforts which add demands on already thin resources.
- Improved Management Practices – Quiet a few areas needing improved management practices were shared: change management, performance management, process management, knowledge management, and enterprise risk management.

Needs shared included:

- Performance Practices – The ability to set clear goals and priorities, a broader view of performance (beyond pavement condition), and "How-Tos" (project delivery, strategic decisions, goals setting).

CalTrans, Utah, Minnesota, Washington, and Texas were identified as DOTs with experiences and/or practices of potential interest.

Practices of note touched on communication (internal partnering initiative, lunch-and-learns, CLEAR program, middle management communication efforts) and the use of goals and performance management practices (use across multiples parts of agencies, meetings between Administration and performance management personnel, use of asset management practices resulting in organizational learning).

GOAL 2 - Examine and share effective organizational models, leadership structures, and competencies used to monitor, respond to, and implement organizational improvement.

Issues shared included:

- Politics – Constantly changing political will and winds negatively impacting the ability to set direction, focus, and governance
- Leadership – A lack of awareness and/or knowledge of options and approaches, a lack of ability or willingness to commit time and other resources with current uncertainties
- Tradition – Hierarchical structures, government risk aversion, set cultures, and inertia which can severely limit efforts to improve

Needs shared included:

- Sharing – examples, peer exchanges, "How-To's"s

Vermont's Certified Public Manager program, ADOT's Transportation Leadership Institute, NDOT's approach to continuous improvement, as well as some tools/processes were identified as DOTs with experiences and/or practices of potential interest.

GOAL 3 - Provide agencies with best practices in the application of process/quality improvement tools and methodologies.

Issues shared included:

- Traditions – Related to structure, practice, and culture
- Politics - Political aspects and their impacts on short-term versus longer-term thinking/planning,
- Immediate Need - A focus on day-to-day responsibilities and reactive work which was impacting time, resources, and views regarding ability to commit to change/improvement work
- Leadership - Raising leadership's understanding for the need and willingness to commit to setting clear priorities

- Getting things to Move – Difficulty in “breaking the dam” or “winning the argument” in regard to the impacts and benefits of established best practices

Connecticut DOT, Nebraska DOT, Colorado DOT, Arizona DOT, Utah DOT were identified as DOTs with experiences and/or practices of potential interest.

MOST PRESSING - Having asked for your thoughts on the goals for the OM subcommittee, we would like to ask for your thoughts on the areas that are most pressing for organizations as they work to improve.

There is a need to invest in organizations

- Skill development – Awareness and clarity regarding role, data, processes (both awareness and improvement)
- Leadership – Strategic thinking, planning, decision-making
- Culture Development – Learning mindset, understanding and adapting to change

APPENDIX 1 - Respondents

The survey indicated respondents would not be identified. To allow for tracking of comments across the survey from the same source, comments are followed by a tracking number. The table below allows the matching of the tracking number with the CPBM connection and organization of the respondents.

In which of the following are you a member or participant? (*Check all that apply*)

Respondent (Tracking #)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**
CBPM (Full Comm)	X					X	X	X			X	X	X		X
Policy Sub-Comm					X							X			
Research Sub-Comm	X														
Professional Development Sub-Comm															
Asset Management Sub-Comm							X								X
Rick Management Sub-Comm							X		X					X	
Organizational Management Sub-Comm		X					X			X					
Other (please specify)	SMET				SMET						Trying to figure out				
ORGANIZATION	Conn DOT	Nev DOT						Vermont Trans	Tx DOT	NC DOT	Mo DOT	Neb DOT			NewMex DOT

APPENDIX 2 – Survey Comments

This appendix contains the actual comments that were offered to the questions of the survey. Each comment is followed by a number in parentheses, which identifies the respondent and allows tracking of comments from the same respondent cross all questions in the survey. Comments are offered with minimal editing.

GOAL 1 - Assist agencies to achieve strategic goal and improve performance in the most effective and efficient way.

Question: *What kinds of issues do you see in organizations that prevent them from achieving strategic goals and improving performance?*

1. A top-down approach to setting strategic goals (which is subject to periodic abrupt changes in direction and lack of continuity, leaving the strategic direction continuity at the mercy of the willingness of the next government leadership to continue current direction) 2. (related to 1.) A lack of organic organizational understanding (by people and units) of specific execution in each person and unit's function in the context of the organizational big picture. (DOTs are sprawling, broad-scope organizations managing often competing objectives and requirements, yet there is a need for agility, synchronization, and yet resilience, in actions. An example would be school of fish, or flock of birds.) 3. DOTs are seen as all-controlling of transportation systems, needs, and context, so they are asked to solve too many problems that may be related to areas not under their control (land use patterns, quality of life, economic development, even health) without the appropriate "skin in the game" (buy-in, participation, accountability) by all government and other decisionmakers. This leads to too much effort that ends up not being followed up on, on areas where collaboration is needed. 4. A true performance culture permeating throughout everyone in the organization - performance management as an organizing principle and force (related to 2.) 5. External support for agency initiatives (in terms of funding, engagement, continuity); decisionmakers and stakeholders need to be accountable too in order to carry out a strategy. 6. Organizational learning through time. Over time, there are recurring relapses in each area that loses key knowledge but there has been no attention on managing and retaining knowledge and in organizational learning. 7. The effort required to change strategic direction is underestimated given the massive effort in preserving and maintaining the giant, indispensable existing systems. When financing needs are overlaid on needs and desires, this results in either long-term plans that are underwhelming in their transformative capacity, or in plans that neglect the existing system, the needs of which are simply postponed and return in short order and with a larger magnitude. (1)
The biggest issue right now is lack of staffing due to high turnover and difficulty filling vacant positions. Other issues that prevent organizations from achieving goals and improving performance include business process inefficiencies, organizational silos, and communication breakdowns (both internal and external). (2)
The high employee turnover greatly decreases the institutional knowledge transfer. (3)
Organizational change management needs for staff to understand the value of having goals, developing a plan to achieve the goals, monitoring the goals, achieving the goal, and then reaching for a stretch goal. (4)
Cultural issues; no clear priorities; lack of leadership are a few. (5)
Change fatigue, wariness of measures because of past experience of them being punitive, no specific people in place to implement and drive improvements. (6)
Lack of policies, procedures, practices, and/or political will around: knowledge management, succession planning, data governance & architecture. Institutional siloing and internal competition. The “just way we do business” attitude. Not correlating change in action to improved performance. (7)
Constantly shifting political priorities; Impactful reactive work; lack of clear leadership and vision; a lack of passion for or aversion to seeking continuous improvement. (8)
Lack of integration of risk with strategy-setting and performance. (9)

Time to focus on improvement strategy with all the daily duty requirements. So much that is shared, prioritizing what to work on with the limited time for improvement strategy. (10)
Confusing aspirational goals with meaningful obtainable goals. Benchmarking performance. Not having a balanced scorecard with meaningful metrics. Mired in the status quo. Unwillingness to change for fear of trying something new. Political pressures. (11)
Project Delivery is always the number 1 issue, yet our organization struggles to find ways to measure and manage delivery performance in a meaningful way. The process is too big and too complex to truly understand the factors that influence delivery. (12)
Limited resources and competing goals. Outside factors. Changing emphases or direction. (13)
Making sure goals are attainable and have leadership buy in. (14)
The issues I see happening are the organization resorts to a worse first approach which is more costly. There are no guidelines set to ensure the goals are met and no checks to reflect on what needs to be done in order to better the issues. (15)

Question: *What topics and/or areas do you feel should be explored and shared to help organizations improve in this area?*

1. Performance-based planning and programming, to tie the fuzzy front end of strategy and planning, to downstream actions. 2. Knowledge management and organizational learning - piloting of applications in KM and organizational management, measuring the effectiveness of each experimentation - trying many different approaches ("tinkering") that do not pose systemic risk to performance. (1)
Recruitment and retention strategies, process improvement, and internal partnering to improve communication and break down silos. (2)
How to decrease the employee turnover. It seems to be nationwide and not just a local issue. (3)
How to develop a performance-based culture. How to overcome dashboard fatigue, so many dashboards, which ones matter. (4)
organizations are so individual. One size doesn't fit all, but success stories are often motivating, What changed due to what action, what results etc. (5)
I just joined this committee so I'm not sure what is already being shared, but in general I think good change management and performance improvement guidelines are helpful. Understanding how to manage change is foundational to improving performance. (6)
Change management strategy and planning. Knowledge and process management. (7)
How to effectively manage from the middle; building coalitions across the organization that can weather all types of change; learning to develop passion for change with an eye toward continuous improvement. (8)
Enterprise Risk Management. (9)
Repository of what has been done, benefit, and who has taken advantage of the idea and institutionalized it. (10)
With respect to pavement management, typically an agency will track physical performance (i.e., % good pavement); however, there are many more facets to gauge performance. One can make the case that the holistic view of performance would include measuring/monitoring/controlling not only physical performance but financial and fiduciary measures. (11)
How to quantify and explain the complicated nature of project delivery and its performance. (12)
Making strategic decisions - what does that mean and how is that done? (13)
Techniques for goal setting. (14)

The topics that should be brought up are the different ways agencies have approached these strategic goals. Another idea is to show the agencies not participating in the goal setting measures difference approaches taken and what the benefits are. (15)

Question: *Does your state have good examples in this area? If so, please include them here!*

Hesitant to say. I believe our DOT's (and most lead-state DOTs') asset management plan processes (as a whole) contain some of the most remarkable organizational learning and transformational examples I have seen. Connecticut's experience I am sure can be shared in this regard. However, it is the perspective on the process (how to apply it to the first two survey questions) that is different from an overall narrative TAMP development process itself. (1)
We have started an internal partnering initiative, but the adoption rate has been slow with minimal results so far/ (2)
NA. (3)
Nothing current I could point to. (5)
asset-related or subject area-focused working groups; open and fluid communications between middle managers, including periodic summits at the bureau level or below; regular check-ins between managers who manage similar groups across the organization, for example, managers of data management teams. Leveraging tools and platforms available to the organization, like Microsoft Power Platform and ArcGIS Online. (8)
Yes. (9)
We have a CLEAR (Communicate Lessons, Exchange Advice, Record) program where we are seeking to create a repository of submitted ideas for change that are processed by leadership and reported on implementation efforts. Lunch and Learns are conducted on some of these ideas to spread them. https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/Value-Management/CLEAR-Program/Pages/default.aspx (10)
We have only 1 measure and we only update it yearly - that is; Percent of the 1-year program (listed in the STIP) that is delivered. The Goal being 100%. We don't usually hit that goal; but explaining why is always super complicated and the public and elected officials are always confused. (12)
We have a performance management team that meets with our Administration to review goals and performance measures. (14)
NMDOT has performance measures done annually which are part of the strategic goals and we report on them quarterly to ensure we are meeting our targets. We use this to track and identify the issues in order to try and correct them for the next quarter. NMDOT does not only use these strategic goals for projects but we use it for other parts of the agency as well. (14)

Question: *Do you know of examples in this area from other DOT's, or elsewhere? If yes, please include them.*

(see above.) Also, CalTrans's performance-based planning and programming is worth sharing with everyone (probably Minnesota and Utah as well), since it provides line of sight from funding to actions. (1)
I'm sure there are many examples from other DOTs but I'm not familiar enough with them to share sufficient information. (2)
NA. (3)
Leveraging tools and platforms available to the organization, like Microsoft Power Platform and ArcGIS Online. (8)
I think Utah, Minnesota, Caltrans, and Washington have ERM programs in addition to us (TxDOT). (9)
We have heard about other states processes at Lean Forums that Colorado hosts. (10)
I do not know of other examples. (12)
No. (14)

GOAL 2 - Examine and share effective organizational models, leadership structures, and competencies used to monitor, respond to, and implement organizational improvement.

Question: *What kinds of issues do you see in organizations that prevent them from establishing organizational models and leadership structures & competencies?*

As in Goal 1, 1. A Top-down approach hinders initiative, experimentation, and accountability. It also hinders continuity because it makes the organization especially subject to abrupt changes of priorities and culture. 2. A risk-averse culture in government organizations as a whole. 3. Lack of continuity of organizational priorities. (1)
Many HR and related functions within state DOTs lack the staffing and resources to transform from a tactical focus to a strategic focus. This prevents the development and sustainment of effective organizational models, leadership structures and competencies needed to become more effective and mature in these areas. (2)
Same as #1. (3) [*The high employee turnover greatly decreases the institutional knowledge transfer.*]
Easy tools and staff to implement the tools. (4)
that is a broad question, not sure I understand, maybe give some examples what you are looking for here. Organizational models and competencies, as in skills? (5)
Because we're a state DOT I think there are a few things that hinder implementation of effective leadership. Culture and age of the agency contribute greatly to this. Most people that are newer are seen as outsiders that are trying to change things without understanding how we do things, people coming in from the outside may not have context but they have a fresh perspective to point out things that don't make sense. Being able to remove this "us versus them" mentality that many agencies face would be helpful. (6)
Lack of policies, procedures, practices, and/or political will around: knowledge management, succession planning. Traditional hierarchies, cults of personality (instead of role stewardship or responsibility), Institutional siloing and internal competition. (7)
Constantly shifting political priorities; Impactful reactive work; lack of clear leadership and vision; a lack of passion for or aversion to seeking continuous improvement. Identifying and mentoring staff with natural leadership talents. (8)
Again, time to commit to further development of this. (10)
Historical inertia - it has always been done this way. I also have been with an agency that seemed to reorg every two-years when some executive heard about a new organizational model. This was met with intense resistance from staff as I was a large disruption to day-to-day work. One of these reorganizations was so capricious in nature that it absolutely destroyed a productive culture and did irreputable harm to the agency. In short, the organization tried to make all division/district uniform in size without consideration to the work output required in those specific groups. A large district with 50% of the road network was staffed at the same level as a rural district with 1/10 the network. I think organizations need to examine both the strengths and weaknesses of the organic occurring leadership and organizational structures before changing seek to enhance. (11)
General skepticism for process improvement or other continuous improvement activities. Many are unfamiliar with the benefits of these things and see them as wasteful uses of time. Some can be b/c teams don't invest in these things sufficiently. All in all, people are strapped for time and they don't want to invest in something they don't understand fully. (12)
Lack of objectivity regarding what is working and what is not. (13)
Lack of coordination, communication, and governance. (14)
Some of the issues I have seen are the ideas that we have always done it this way. Some other issues I have seen are the upper management is put into the position with no experience. This in turn creates a learning curve which would prevent the agency from doing better. (15)

Question: *What topics and/or areas do you feel should be explored and shared to help organizations improve in this area?*

In addition to Lean kinds of initiatives, which can garner some new ideas on improving processes, the need to have a safe innovation culture (one that is risk-based in terms of impacts of innovation, systemic risk, etc.) is clear (to me.) The "cultural transfer of tacit knowledge" as is now referred to in at least some literature, merits attention. It is usually not measured (or quantifiable). (1)
How to transform HR and related functions to become more strategic How to build and align organizational models, leadership structure, and competencies to support the accomplishment of strategic goals and organizational improvement. (2)
Succession planning for public institutions. (7)
How to effectively manage from the middle; building coalitions across the organization that can weather all types of change; learning to develop passion for change with an eye toward continuous improvement; identifying leadership skills in others; mentoring future leaders. (8)
Job description repository, hierarchies would benefit. (10)
Understand the difference between a mission, objective, goal and work. Leadership - its not just a work. Teamwork - trust the staff to get the work done. (11)
Practical examples of how to set up models; practical examples of projects; and directly education to executives who can influence these things. (12)
Peer exchange discussions to learn how other state DOTs handle these areas. (14)
How to work with the working groups in order to establish these strategic goals. Identify some questions to ask. Identify how you are going to ensure these goals are met. (15)

Question: *Does your state have good examples in this area? If so, please include them here!*

Not anything that is unique beyond a concerted, focused, dedicated effort to navigate the current transportation system and macro environment, as I'm sure many other peer agencies are doing. (1)
No. (2)
Vermont Certified Public Managers program; AOT's Transportation Leadership Institute; Open and fluid communications between middle managers, including periodic summits at the bureau level or below; regular check-ins between managers who manage similar groups across the organization, for example, managers of data management teams. Leveraging tools and platforms available to the organization, like Microsoft Power Platform and ArcGIS Online. (8)
We have a directory, with names/positions but not necessarily job descriptions. Table of Contents could be a resource for other states to find out those details from those who manage an area of interest. https://apps.ncdot.gov/dot/directory/ (10)
Yes. Continuous Improvement was spearheaded by the last governor and made into a formal, resourced activity in all branches of government (Nebraska). The model is very formal at NDOT and there are many projects that have been successful. (12)
We have several governance processes that we use to ensure that everyone is informed. (14)

Question: *Do you know of examples in this area from other DOT's, or elsewhere? If yes, please include them.*

I do not. (1)
No. (2)
Gallup Strength Finders. (8)
I am sure other states have directories. Although can't call them out. (10)
I do not. (12)
No. (14)

GOAL 3 - Provide agencies with best practices in the application of process/quality improvement tools and methodologies.

Question: *What kinds of issues do you see in organizations that prevent them from establishing organizational models and leadership structures & competencies?*

1. The top-down, hierarchical tradition of agencies hinders frank and open conversation (both communicating issues and drawing out the causes of issues). (1)
As stated in response to Goal 2, organizations often operate very reactively and focus on the day-to-day tactical needs of the organization without building and sustaining the organizational models, leadership structures, and competencies needed for long-term success and continuous improvement. (2)
The idea that improvements and new tools are somehow punitive or reactive to the individual's performance and not the org as a whole. (6)
Political will Privileging good optics over systemic change (e.g., collecting one-off savings stories instead of implementing efficiency expectations and practices enterprise wide). Overemphasis on capital projects, underemphasis on business management Promoting untrained individuals into administrative positions (i.e., engineers into upper management without any additional professional development or education in their new sphere). (7)
Constantly shifting political priorities; Impactful reactive work; lack of clear leadership and vision; a lack of passion for or aversion to seeking continuous improvement. Identifying and mentoring staff with natural leadership talents. (8)
This question may not have been written appropriately (same as Goal 2). Time to develop tools and methods again is my answer. (10)
Failure to understand all aspects and the relationships between production and quality the basis of which are - People, Process, Technology, Time, Money, Schedule. When these items are all in agreement and alignment you will achieve quality outcome. For instance People are related to: Scope by demonstrating understanding Schedule by commitment Process by documentation Technology by training. (11)
Having leadership buy in. If they don't understand the value of these things, they will never provide resources for it. Making sure the leadership understands tools and methodologies is key. it also helps to have structure. I.e. someone to keep it all organized and directed. Ad hoc is fine; but having dedicated staff and curriculum is helpful. (12)
Bureaucracy that stifles innovation. Lack of employee empowerment. (13)

Question: *What kinds of issues do you see in organizations that prevent them from implementing process/quality tools and methodologies?*

The causality in the relationship between risk aversion and a focus on the assignment of blame is difficult to infer, but the two are correlated. Regardless of the relationship, there is a natural tendency to avoid "examining the mechanics of shortcomings." (1)
Organizational silos, lack of staffing in general, and inadequate skills and the allocated staff/resources needed to build process/quality improvement capability. (2)
Need examples of efficient and effective processes. (4)
Best practice communication strategies for rolling out new processes and tools. (6)
Lack of political will, the “just way we do business” attitude. Inability to manage change. (7)
Lack of adequate skills with tools available; Inability or unwillingness to recognize the "perfect" as the enemy of the "good", and the value that *continuous* improvement adds to the process. (8)
IT support infrastructures, many ideas lead to tools that need IT support. (10)
Failing to balance six key elements of quality: performance, talent, competitiveness (yes public sector should be competitive with the private sector), effectiveness, value and governance. (11)

Sometimes they don't know where to start. When they do, they don't have the support they need. Having access to training on various tools/methods, is the beginning. I'll stress again that leadership is needed. (12)
Establishing more processes to manage processes. Other considerations - lack of vision, cost to implement, implementing too slowly and losing relevance or momentum. (13)
I don't think organizations prevent them from implementing processes. I just think they do have a process(es) in place they just have not documented them or set measures on them to say they are goals. (15)

Question: *Does your state have good examples in this area? If so, please include them here!*

The CTDOT participated in LEAN events to improve processes over a number of years, with several successes in addressing the process issues that seemed intractable from traditional perspectives. Several LEAN outcomes can probably be shared, though the staff associated with them may not be still working at CTDOT. (1)
No. (2)
Engineers unable or unwilling to see beyond their area of expertise, or unwilling to learn new skills. Managers with a lack of leadership skills or talent. (8)
We have a dedicated IT team to Transportation that prioritizes business needs, this is helpful to NCDOT. (10)
Yes and no. In the last 8 years, the governor of Nebraska was very active and supportive of OM/CI activities. The new governor has allowed it to continue; but isn't providing the same leadership. The Center for Operational Excellence in Nebraska could serve as model others could study. (12)

Question: *Do you know of examples in this area from other DOT's, or elsewhere? If yes, please include them.*

No. (1)
Colorado DOT, Arizona DOT, and Utah DOT come to mind as states to benchmark in these areas. (2)
ADKAR tends to be successful for us when we stick to it. (6)
Unfortunately, the world is a target-rich environment. (8)
During the lean forums some states have shared applications tools/methods developed. (10)
No. (12)
No. (14)

MOST PRESSING

Question: *Having asked for your thoughts on the goals for the OM subcommittee, we would like to ask for your thoughts on the areas that are most pressing for organizations as they work to improve.*

I would refer the sub-committee to the answer to the first question in the first goal - the question was sufficiently broad to induce a broad response on diagnosis. Continuing to develop a performance culture throughout the organization, working on balancing innovation without ignoring risk, and retaining the learning in the organization seem at first glance to be foundational in continuing to progress in the field. (1)
Recruitment and retention, Leadership development, and Process improvement (including change capability). (2)
Knowledge (data, information, roles and responsibilities) management. (7)
With the impact that climate change and the Great Retirement is having on our business, the ability to learn new skills, develop new leaders, and embrace continuous improvement is very important. We need to at least be okay with, if not embrace, variability in this era. Being flexible is key. (8)
Enterprise Risk, Change Management, Succession Planning/Knowledge Management, Performance Management, Strategy, Resiliency, and Automation (leveraging processes or tools - like A.I.). (9)
One stop shop for improvement ideas, structural business tools, and systematic tools that have benefited states. (10)
The availability of more and more funding, along with workforce challenges makes it very hard to deliver projects like we want to. This stretches people farther and farther, leaving less time for process improvement or continuous improvement activities. (12)
Leadership skills. Strategic thinking. (13)
I think the most pressing is to ensure you have the buy in of executive staff in order to support your processes and back you up with the working groups. Another area is to ensure executive staff understand the reason for the process and the measures. (15)

APPENDIX 2 - Respondents

The survey indicated respondents would not be identified. To allow for tracking of comments across the survey from the same source, comments are followed by a tracking number. The table below allows the matching of the tracking number with the CPBM connection and organization of the respondents.

In which of the following are you a member or participant? (*Check all that apply*)

Respondent (Tracking #)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**
CBPM (Full Comm)	X					X	X	X			X	X	X		X
Policy Sub-Comm					X							X			
Research Sub-Comm	X														
Professional Development Sub-Comm															
Asset Management Sub-Comm							X								X
Rick Management Sub-Comm							X		X					X	
Organizational Management Sub-Comm		X					X			X					
Other (please specify)	SMET				SMET						Trying to figure out				
ORGANIZATION	Conn DOT	Nev DOT						Vermont Trans	Tx DOT	NC DOT	Mo DOT	Neb DOT			NewMex DOT